

# FY 2006 RANKING CRITERIA WORKSHEET- GRAZING LANDS

## LAS VEGAS FIELD OFFICE

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Farm No. \_\_\_\_\_ Tract No. \_\_\_\_\_ CMS Field No's. \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Tribal Land \_\_\_\_\_ Non-Tribal Land \_\_\_\_\_ Preliminary Rating \_\_\_\_ Final Rating \_\_\_\_

### 1. Plants - Potential Points 100

Note: Instructions on separate sheet		% Area in Contract Before Treatment		% Area in Contract After Treatment.		Potential Points	Points Bench Mark	Points After
<b>Rangelands:</b>	SI of 76-1 00 w/trend up or not apparent	%	___ + ___ + ___ =	%		100		
Ecological	SI of 51-75 with upward trend	%	___ + ___ + ___ =	%		80		
Site	SI of 51-75 with downward trend	%	___ + ___ + ___ =	%		20		
Similarity	SI of 26-50 with upward trend	%	___ + ___ + ___ =	%		60		
Index	SI of 26-50 with downward trend	%	___ + ___ + ___ =	%		10		
(SI)*	SI of 0-25 with upward trend	%	___ + ___ + ___ =	%		40		
	SI of 0-25 with downward trend	%	___ + ___ + ___ =	%		0		
<b>Riparian</b>	Use Attachment 1, 2, or 3	% Quality Bench Mark: _____	%	% Quality After: _____	%	100		
<b>Grazed Forest:</b>	Use Attachment 4	% Quality Bench Mark: _____	%	% Quality After: _____	%	100		
<b>1. Plants</b>		Total	100%	Total	100%	<b>Total:</b>		

### 2. Conservation Practice(s) Selection Potential Points - 70

Any practice used in the ranking criteria and intended to be included in the conservation plan of operations must be a cost-shared practice or have an incentive payment. Higher priority (value) should be given to those practices which address multiple resource concerns, are cost effective, and have longer life spans. Select resource concerns from NM Quality Criteria Guide.	Potential Points	Percent of Need to be Installed	After Points
Soil Erosion (sheet & rill); Water (inefficient use); Plants (productivity,health & vigor); Animals (inadequate quantity/quality of forage & water)			
Pumping Plant (533)	10		
Fence (382)	10		
Well (642)	10		
Watering Facility (614)	5		
Pipeline (516)	10		
Spring Development	5		
Pond (378)	10		
Soil Erosion (classic gully)			
Diversion (362); Grade Stabe. (410)	10		
Soil Erosion (ephemeral gully); Water Quantity (excessive runoff); Plant Condition (invasive plants); Animals (inadequate quantity/quality of forage)			
Brush Management			
Level of Infestation      % Area Needing Treatment      % Area to be Treated in Contract			
Light	20		
Medium	40		
Heavy	60		
2. Conservation Practice Selection	Total:		

# FY 2006 RANKING CRITERIA WORKSHEET- GRAZING LANDS

## LAS VEGAS FIELD OFFICE

### 3. Other Considerations - Potential Points - 35

Items A thru E are required.	Potential Points	Bench-mark Points	After Points
A. At risk species habitat will be enhanced. (List the species impacted)	5	0	
B. Treatment of this land could have a beneficial impact on a 303d listed stream segment.	5	0	
project.	5	0	
D. The land is within a NMED designated Category I watershed.	5	0	
E. Proposed contracted area will be treated to eradicate and/or prevent infestation of Class A and/or Class B noxious weeds, as designated by NMDA	15	0	
<b>3. Other Considerations</b>	<b>Total:</b>		

Total Points (After minus Benchmark): Section 1\_\_\_\_\_ Section 2\_\_\_\_\_ Section 3\_\_\_\_\_ Total for Worksheet \_\_\_\_\_

**Note: In the event of a tie, contracts will be awarded to the application with the most points in Section 1 followed by the Section 2 and so on.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Designated Conservationist

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

8

\_\_\_\_\_  
Producer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date